arXiv:1704.04563v1 [gr-qc] 15 Apr 2017

Non-minimally coupled scalar field cosmology with torsion

Antonella Cid[1]*, Fernando Izaurieta[2]†, Perla Medina[2]‡, Daniela Narbona[2]§

[1] Departamento de Física and Grupo de Cosmología y Gravitación GCG-UBB,
Universidad del Bío-Bío, Casilla 5-C, Concepción, Chile.

[2] Departamento de Física, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile.

April 18, 2017

Abstract

In this work we present a generalized Brans-Dicke Lagrangian including a non-minimally coupled Gauss-Bonnet term without imposing the vanishing torsion condition. In the field equations obtained the torsion is closed related to the dynamics of the scalar field, i.e. if non-minimally coupled terms are present in the theory, the torsion must be present. For the studied Lagrangian we analyse the cosmological consequences of consider an effective torsional fluid in the description of the universe. We show that in the proposed scenario the effective torsional fluid can be responsible for the current acceleration of the universe.

1 Introduction

Gravity theories with non-minimally coupled scalar fields is one of the alternatives to General Relativity, the so-called scalar-tensor theories [1]. The existence of such additional fields in the gravitational sector may have important consequences in the description of the gravitational interaction, in this context the archetypical scenario is the addition of one scalar field, the so called Brans-Dicke theory [2]. Among the various scalar-tensor theories that have been studied over the years, the Horndeski theory is the most general theory in a four-dimensional spacetime yielding second order field equations [3].

On the other hand, the accelerated expanding phases that experiences our universe are the main topics of study in modern cosmology. The fact that the acceleration presented in the early universe (inflationary models) and in the late universe (dark energy models) can be described by scalar fields have become the study of scalar-tensor theories very appealing.

*acidm@ubiobio.cl
†fizaurie@udec.cl
‡perlamedina@udec.cl
§danielanarbona@udec.cl

The first work in scalar-tensor cosmology was developed by Peebles and Dicke in 1968 [4], the authors use the Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric in the Brans-Dicke theory [2] with the aim of studying the early universe, specifically the formation of primordial elements. Subsequently, in 1989 La and Steinhardt attempt to solve the graceful exit problem of old inflation with their model of extended inflation [5]. In spite of in this model the Brans-Dicke parameter has to be small, which is in conflict with observational limits, this work promotes scalar-tensor theories as worthy to construct cosmological models. Since then many scalar-tensor cosmological models has been proposed and studied [6]. Particularly scalar-tensor theories has been used to model the late acceleration of the universe given that scalar fields are good candidates to describe dark energy in terms of phantom and quintessence fields [7, 8].

In General Relativity the spacetime is described by a single rank-2 tensor field, the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. In the first order formalism, the vierbein (or the metric) and the spin connection (or the affine connection) are independent concepts, so the geometry is not completely determined by the metric, instead a geometric quality of spacetime appears: the torsion T^a, which in the second order formalism is fixed by the constraint $T^a = 0$ [9].

The addition of torsion into gravity theories and particularly into cosmology has been studied, from two points of view. In Refs.[10, 11] the author added a fermion fluid in the matter content, obtaining a cosmological model where the torsion generates accelerated expansion in the early universe. Another approach is realized in Ref.[12], where the authors considered the Gauss-Bonnet term coupled to a scalar field and the Einstein-Hilbert action with cosmological constant, in the frame of non-vanishing torsion, they find field equations with explicit torsion and present some cosmological scenarios. This last work has been generalized to the full Horndeski theory, where any non-minimally coupled term or second order derivatives in the scalar field are source of torsion [13].

The aim of this work is to investigate if an effective torsional fluid in the framework of the Horndeski theory with torsion, particularly a generalized Brans-Dicke model, can describe the late evolution of the universe without considering additional scalar fields. The paper is presented as follows, in section 2 we describe the Horndeski theory with torsion in the frame of FLRW geometry, in section 3 we construct a cosmological model in order to explain the current acceleration of the universe in terms of an effective torsional fluid. Finally in section 4 we present the final discussion.

2 Torsion, non-minimal couplings and FLRW geometry

In Ref.[13], it was studied the consequences of not imposing from the beginning the torsionless condition on the Horndeski Lagrangian. When this constraint is relaxed, it is possible to prove that non-minimal couplings between the scalar field ϕ and curvature, and terms involving second order terms $\nabla_\mu \partial_\mu \phi$ in the lagrangian are sources of torsion. In general, the dynamics of the system strongly departs from the classical riemannian case, and it is possible to have non-vanishing torsion even in the absence of fermionic matter. Let us consider an action principle corresponding to a generalized Brans-Dicke theory and a Gauss-Bonnet term as the one proposed in Ref.[12] of the

form

$$S=\int \mathrm{d}x^4\sqrt{|g|}\left[\frac{1}{2\kappa_4}N\left(\phi\right)R+M\left(\phi\right)\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi-V\left(\phi\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+U\left(\phi\right)\left(R^2-4R^\mu{}_\nu R^\nu{}_\mu+R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma}R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}\right)+\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{M}}\right], \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{M}}$ is a Lagrangian for matter, and $N\left(\phi\right)$, $M\left(\phi\right)$, $V\left(\phi\right)$ and $U\left(\phi\right)$ are functions of ϕ. $R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}$ is the Lorentz curvature for the connection $\Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu}=\mathring{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\mu\nu}+K^\lambda{}_{\nu\mu}$, where $\mathring{\Gamma}^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ corresponds to the Christoffel connection and $K^\lambda{}_{\nu\mu}$ to the contorsion tensor. The Lorentz curvature is related to the standard Riemann $\mathring{R}^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}$ tensor through

$$R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}=\mathring{R}^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}+\mathring{\nabla}_\mu K^{\rho\sigma}{}_\nu-\mathring{\nabla}_\nu K^{\rho\sigma}{}_\mu+K^\rho{}_{\lambda\mu}K^{\lambda\sigma}{}_\nu-K^\rho{}_{\lambda\nu}K^{\lambda\sigma}{}_\mu.$$

Since the torsionless condition is not being imposed from the beginning, metricity and parallelism represent different degrees of freedom. Therefore, they must be varied independently (à la Palatini when they are codified by the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and the connection $\Gamma^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$, or à la Cartan when they are codified by the vierbein e^a and the spin connection ω^{ab}).

In this context, the equations of motion are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu}=-\frac{1}{2\kappa_4}\left[N\left(R_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R\right)+\kappa_4 M\partial_\lambda\phi\partial^\lambda\phi g_{\mu\nu}+2\kappa_4 V g_{\mu\nu}-2\kappa_4 M\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi-\kappa_4\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}\right]=0, \tag{2}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mu\nu\lambda}=\frac{1}{2\kappa_4}\left[N\left(T_{\lambda\mu\nu}+T^\rho{}_{\rho\mu}g_{\lambda\nu}-T^\rho{}_{\rho\nu}g_{\lambda\mu}\right)+\left\{\frac{\partial N}{\partial\phi}+4\kappa_4\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi}R\right\}\left(g_{\lambda\mu}\partial_\nu\phi-g_{\lambda\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\right)\right.$$
$$\left.+8\kappa_4\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi}\left[\partial_\rho\phi\left(R^\rho{}_\mu g_{\lambda\nu}-R^\rho{}_\nu g_{\lambda\mu}-R^{\rho\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu}\right)+\partial_\mu\phi R_{\lambda\nu}-\partial_\nu\phi R_{\lambda\mu}\right]-\kappa_4\sigma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}\right]=0, \tag{3}$$

$$\mathcal{E}=\frac{1}{2\kappa_4}\frac{\partial N}{\partial\phi}R+\frac{\partial M}{\partial\phi}X-\frac{\partial V}{\partial\phi}+\frac{\partial M}{\partial\phi}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi+M\nabla_\mu\partial^\mu\phi+MZ^aT^b{}_{ab}$$
$$+\frac{\partial U}{\partial\phi}\left(R^2-4R^\mu{}_\nu R^\nu{}_\mu+R^{\mu\nu}{}_{\rho\sigma}R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\mu\nu}\right)=0, \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}$ and $\sigma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$ stand for the energy-momentum tensor and the spin tensor associated to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{M}}$, and $T^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}$ is the torsion.

The Eq. (3) implies that torsion depends on the derivatives of the scalar field, and it does not vanish even when $\sigma^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}=0$. The terms which generate this feature are precisely the non-minimal couplings. This behaviour stands in strong contrast with the standard minimally coupled Einstein–Hilbert–Cartan case, where only the spin tensor associated to fermions can give rise to torsion, and in such way that it can not propagate in vacuum.

Another interesting feature is that just setting $T^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}=0$ in the equations of motion does not lead to the standard expressions we would get for the standard torsionless case with the Christoffel connection. Instead, imposing $T^\lambda{}_{\mu\nu}=0$ on the equations of motion freezes the scalar field and it leads to $\partial_\mu\phi=0$.

This behaviour reveals that the torsional and torsionless case correspond to different dynamical systems when non-minimal couplings are present (see Ref.[13] for a treatment on the full Horndeski Lagrangian). The right way of recovering the torsionless case is to include a Lagrange multiplier constraint in the action (1),

$$\bar{S} = S + \int \mathrm{d}x^4 \sqrt{|g|} \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{\lambda\mu\nu} T_{\lambda\mu\nu}.$$

In our case, the equations of motion for the torsionless constrained case are recovered[1]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\mu\nu} &= \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\nabla_\lambda \left(\lambda^{\mu\nu\lambda} + \lambda^{\nu\mu\lambda}\right) = 0, \\
\overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\mu\nu\lambda} &= \mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda^{\mu\nu\lambda} - \lambda^{\nu\mu\lambda}\right) = 0, \\
\overline{\mathcal{E}} &= \mathcal{E} = 0, \\
T_{\lambda\mu\nu} &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The solution to this system corresponds to the classical riemannian case

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mu\nu} + \nabla_\lambda \left(\mathcal{E}^{\lambda\mu\nu} + \mathcal{E}^{\lambda\nu\mu}\right)\big|_{T_{\alpha\beta\gamma}=0} = 0, \tag{5}$$

$$\mathcal{E}|_{T_{\alpha\beta\gamma}=0} = 0. \tag{6}$$

It is interesting to note that the field equations (5) and (6), considering the definitions (2)-(4), are reduced to the field equations of the standard Brans-Dicke theory in the Jordan frame presented for example in Ref.[14] in the particular case of $N(\phi) = \phi$, $M(\phi) = \frac{\omega}{2\phi}$ and $U(\phi) = 0$.

On the other hand, the role of torsion in cosmology has been studied in the context of standard Einstein–Cartan geometry without scalar fields in Refs.[10, 11]. In this context, torsion can play an important role only inside of a very dense fermionic plasma, as in the Big Bounce model presented in Ref.[11]. Inside of standard fermionic matter at usual densities, the effects of torsion are extremely small, see for instance chapter 8 of Ref.[15]. Torsion generated by non-minimal couplings in the context of cosmology was presented in Ref.[12], but only for the Gauss-Bonnet coupling. Here we will follow closely Ref.[12] for the treatment of torsion in a cosmological context, and our construction reduces to their case when $N(\phi) = 1$, $M(\phi) = 0$, $V(\phi) = \Lambda$ and $U(\phi) = \frac{\phi}{4}$.

In the classical case, the requirement of spatial homogeneity and isotropy is reflected on the condition

$$\pounds_{\vec{\zeta}}\, g_{\mu\nu} = 0,$$

for the vectorial fields $\vec{\zeta}$ corresponding to spatial translations and rotations, leading to the Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric,

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\left(\frac{dr^2}{1-kr^2} + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2\theta\; d\phi^2\right),$$

[1] In Ref.[13] the results are presented in the first order formalism, in the language of differential forms. The Lagrange multiplier $\lambda^{\lambda\mu\nu}$ in this article and the 2-form Lagrange multiplier Λ^a of Ref.[13] are related through $\frac{1}{2} e^a{}_\beta \lambda^\beta{}_{\mu\nu} \mathrm{d}x^\mu \wedge \mathrm{d}x^\nu = - * \Lambda^a$.

depending only in the scale factor $a(t)$, where (t, r, θ, ϕ) are the coordinates in the comoving frame. From here on we will consider $\kappa_4 = c = 1$. A non-vanishing torsion implies new independent degrees of freedom for the geometry, which must also satisfy spatial homogeneity and isotropy. This degrees of freedom are codified in the contorsion tensor,

$$K^{\lambda}{}_{\nu\mu} = \Gamma^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu} - \mathring{\Gamma}^{\lambda}_{\mu\nu},$$

and therefore we must require

$$\pounds_{\vec{\zeta}}\, K^{\lambda}{}_{\mu\nu} = 0,$$

for vectorial fields $\vec{\zeta}$ corresponding to spatial translations and rotations. This leads us to a "FLRW contorsion" parametrized in $d = 4$ as

$$K_{\mu\nu\lambda} = (g_{\mu\lambda}g_{\nu\rho} - g_{\mu\rho}g_{\nu\lambda})\, h^{\rho} + \sqrt{|g|}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}f^{\rho},$$

or a FLRW torsion given by

$$T_{\lambda\mu\nu} = (g_{\mu\lambda}g_{\nu\rho} - g_{\mu\rho}g_{\nu\lambda})\, h^{\rho} - 2\sqrt{|g|}\epsilon_{\lambda\mu\nu\rho}f^{\rho}.$$

Here h^{ρ} and f^{ρ} are two vectors that in the comoving frame take the form

$$h_0 = h(t), \quad h_i = 0, \quad f_0 = f(t) \quad \text{and} \quad f_i = 0,$$

with $i = 1, 2, 3$.

In this sense, the cosmological evolution is characterized by the temporal evolution of three parameters $a(t)$, $h(t)$ and $f(t)$, instead of only $a(t)$ as in the classical riemmanian case. For the sake of simplicity, we will suppose only classical spin-less matter with vanishing spin tensor

$$\sigma_{\lambda\mu\nu} = 0.$$

It means that we will consider torsion produced only by the scalar field ϕ. By considering a energy-momentum tensor for $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{M}}$ corresponding to a barotropic fluid, given by the classical expression $\mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu} = (p + \rho)\, u_{\mu}u_{\nu} + pg_{\mu\nu}$ (where ρ is the energy density, p is the pressure and u^{μ} the four velocity of an observer comoving with the fluid), the generalized FLRW-equations for the geometry are given by

$$3N\left[(H+h)^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} - f^2\right] - \left[\frac{M\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V\right] = \rho, \tag{7}$$

$$N\left(2(\dot{H}+\dot{h}) + (3H+h)(H+h) + \frac{k}{a^2} - f^2\right) + \frac{M\dot{\phi}^2}{2} - V = -p, \tag{8}$$

$$Nh - \dot{\phi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi} + 4\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi}\left[(H+h)^2 + \frac{k}{a^2} - f^2\right]\right) = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$f\left[N - 8\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi}\dot{\phi}\,(H+h)\right] = 0, \tag{10}$$

where we have considered the Hubble expansion rate $H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a}$, dots denote derivatives with respect to the cosmic time t. In the same way, the equation of motion for the scalar field is given by

$$3\frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi}\left\{(\dot{H}+\dot{h})+H(H+h)+(H+h)^2+\frac{k}{a^2}-f^2\right\}-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial M}{\partial \phi}\dot{\phi}^2-\frac{\partial V}{\partial \phi}-M\left\{\ddot{\phi}+3\dot{\phi}H\right\}$$
$$+24\frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi}\left\{\left[(\dot{H}+\dot{h})+H(H+h)\right]\left[(H+h)^2+\frac{k}{a^2}-f^2\right]-2f(H+h)(\dot{f}+Hf)\right\}=0. \quad (11)$$

3 Cosmological Scenario

In cosmology it is common to consider effective fluids in the study of scalar-tensor theories of gravity [16], given that the torsion is closed related to the scalar field in our model, we define an effective fluid associated to the torsion through:

$$\rho_T = \frac{M\dot{\phi}^2}{2}+V+3\left(H^2+\frac{k}{a^2}\right)(1-N)-3N\left(2Hh+h^2-f^2\right), \quad (12)$$

$$p_T = \frac{M\dot{\phi}^2}{2}-V-\left(3H^2+\frac{k}{a^2}+2\dot{H}\right)(1-N)+N\left(2\dot{h}+4Hh+h^2-f^2\right), \quad (13)$$

in such a way that now, the field equations can be cast in the standard form for a universe filled with two non-interacting fluids, ρ and ρ_T in the following way:

$$3\left(H^2+\frac{k}{a^2}\right)=\rho+\rho_T, \quad (14)$$

$$2\dot{H}+3H^2+\frac{k}{a^2}=-p-p_T, \quad (15)$$

$$\dot{\rho}+3H(\rho+p)=0, \quad (16)$$

$$\dot{\rho_T}+3H(\rho_T+p_T)=0. \quad (17)$$

We note that we recover the expressions for the effective density and pressure defined in Ref.[12] for $N(\phi)=1$, $M(\phi)=0$ and $V(\phi)=\Lambda$, where we have generalized the cosmological constant to the potential of the scalar field ϕ and we have considered it as part of the total energy-momentum tensor instead of as part of the gravitational sector as in Ref.[12].

On the other hand, following Ref.[12] we find conditions to analytically solve the system of Eqs.(7)-(11) in order to show a particular solution which describes a cosmological scenario where the acceleration of the universe is driven by the effective torsional fluid defined through (12) and

(13). To do this we rewrite the set of Eqs.(7)-(11) in the following way:

$$Z^2 + W - \frac{V}{3N} = \frac{1}{3N}\left(\rho + \frac{1}{2}M\dot{\phi}^2\right), \tag{18}$$

$$2\dot{Z} + 2HZ + Z^2 + W - \frac{V}{N} = -\frac{1}{N}\left(p + \frac{1}{2}M\dot{\phi}^2\right), \tag{19}$$

$$-Nh + 4U'\dot{\phi}\left(Z^2 + W\right) = -\frac{1}{2}N'\dot{\phi}, \tag{20}$$

$$f\left(N - 8U'\dot{\phi}Z\right) = 0, \tag{21}$$

$$\left(\dot{Z} + HZ + Z^2 + W\right)\frac{N'}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\left[\frac{1}{2}M'\dot{\phi}^2 + V' + M\left(\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi}\right)\right]$$
$$+4U'\left[\left(Z^2 + W\right)\left(\dot{Z} + HZ\right) - 2fZ\left(\dot{f} + Hf\right)\right] = 0, \tag{22}$$

where prime denotes derivative with respect to ϕ and we have defined:

$$Z = H + h, \tag{23}$$

$$W = \frac{k}{a^2} - f^2, \tag{24}$$

The case studied in Ref.[12] corresponds to $N(\phi) = 1$, $M(\phi) = 0$, $V(\phi) = \Lambda$, $U(\phi) = \frac{\phi}{4}$ in our case.

Assuming $f \neq 0$ in Eq.(21), we get $U' = \frac{N}{8\dot{\phi}Z}$, and by replacing this in Eq.(20) we have:

$$W = Z\left(2h - Z - \frac{N'}{N}\dot{\phi}\right) = Z\left(Z - 2H - \frac{N'}{N}\dot{\phi}\right). \tag{25}$$

3.1 Solutions for presureless matter

In the late universe the energy-momentum tensor must consider the baryonic matter and/or dark matter, both of which behave as pressureless matter ($p = 0$) at cosmological scales. Now, by replacing (25) into Eq.(19), rewriting $\dot{\phi}$ in terms of U' through Eq.(21) and considering $p = 0$ we have:

$$2(\dot{Z} + Z^2) = \frac{N'}{8U'} + \frac{V}{N} - \frac{MN}{128U'^2Z^2}. \tag{26}$$

From (26) we note that by choosing the conditions:

$$M(\phi) = 0, \quad V(\phi) = \beta N(\phi), \quad U'(\phi) = \alpha N'(\phi), \tag{27}$$

we are able to find an analytical solution for the theory, where α and β are constants. This theory corresponds to a generalized Brans-Dicke theory without the kinetic term and including a non-minimally coupled Gauss-Bonnet term. With conditions (27) we get:

$$Z(\tau) = Z_\infty \tanh(\tau), \tag{28}$$

where $Z_\infty = \sqrt{\frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{1}{16\alpha}}$, $\tau = Z_\infty(t - t_i)$ is a rescaled dimensionless time and t_i is an integration constant. Besides, from Eq.(21) it is not difficult to note that,

$$N(\tau) = N_* \, \sinh(\tau)^{\frac{1}{8\alpha Z_\infty^2}}, \tag{29}$$

where N_* is an integration constant.

On the other hand, by deriving Eq.(18) and replacing Eqs.(18), (19) and (22) we get the conservation equation for the energy-momentum tensor of pressureless matter $\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0$, and by integrating for $p = 0$ we get $\rho = \rho_{m0} \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3$, where the subscript 0 indicates current values. By replacing this last result into Eq.(18) we get:

$$N\left(6Z^2 - 3Z\left(2\frac{\dot{a}}{a} + \frac{\dot{N}}{N}\right) - \beta\right) = \rho_{m0}\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3, \tag{30}$$

where we have used Eq.(25). By using Eqs.(28) and (29) into Eq.(30) we can integrate to get the form of a dimensionless scale factor:

$$\bar{a}(\tau) = \frac{a}{a_0} = \bar{a}_1 \cosh(\tau)\sinh(\tau)^{-1+x}\left(1 - y\tanh(\tau)\right)^{1/3}, \tag{31}$$

where for convenience we have defined the dimensionless parameters $x = \beta Z_\infty^{-2}/3$ and $y = 3v\bar{a}_1^{-3}$, besides v is a dimensionless constant defined as $v = \frac{\rho_{m0} a_0^3}{6Z_\infty^2 N_*} > 0$ and $\bar{a}_1$ is an integration constant which must be positive in order to be consistent with a positive scale factor. Notice that the behaviour of the scale factor is independent of the exact functional form of $N(\phi)$ when $V(\phi)$ and $U(\phi)$ are defined through $V(\phi) = \beta N(\phi)$ and $U'(\phi) = \alpha N'(\phi)$ respectively.

In the same way, we can obtain $h(\tau)$ and $f(\tau)$ from Eqs.(23) and (24) respectively:

$$h(\tau) = Z_\infty\left((1 - x)\coth(\tau) + \frac{y\,\mathrm{sech}^2(\tau)}{3\left(1 - y\tanh(\tau)\right)}\right), \tag{32}$$

$$f(\tau) = \pm\sqrt{\frac{k\tanh^2(\tau)\left(1 - y\tanh(\tau)\right)^{-2/3}}{\bar{a}_1^2\sinh(\tau)^{2x}} - \frac{\mathrm{Z}_\infty^2\left(x - Y\tanh(\tau)\right)}{1 - y\tanh(\tau)}}, \tag{33}$$

where $Y = y\left(-1 + x + \mathrm{sech}(\tau)^2/3\right) + \tanh(\tau)$.

Without loss of generality we can assume $t_i = 0$ in order to show the different behaviours the scale factor presents depending on the parameters x and y as we can see in Table 1.

We recover most of the cosmological scenarios presented in Ref.[12] except the Big-Rip scenario [17], where the scale factor diverge at finite time for $\Lambda < 0$. The solutions presented in [12] correspond to a different branch of analytical solutions, in which $V(\phi) = \Lambda$ and $U'(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}$, in our case $U' \propto V'$.

From the cosmological point of view, the most interesting behaviour is the one associated with $x > 1$ and $0 < y < 1$, where the scale factor starts with a null value at $\tau = 0$. In this case we can have different behaviours depending on the parameters, see Figure 1.

In order to analyse in more detail the most interesting scenario, the one with the sign-transition from decelerated expansion to accelerated expansion, the case (a) in Table 1, we calculate

	Conditions	Behaviour of the dimensionless scale factor
(a)	$1 < x < 2$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) = 0$, then it expands decelerated and subsequently accelerated
(b)	$x > 2$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) = 0$, then it accelerated expands
(c)	$x > 1$ and $y > 1$	$\bar{a}(0) = 0$, then it expands to a maximum, subsequently it contracts and eventually collapse
(d)	$0 < x < 1$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) \to \infty$, then it contracts to a minimum and subsequently it accelerated expands
(e)	$x < 1$ and $y > 1$	$\bar{a}(0) \to \infty$ then it contracts and eventually collapse
(f)	$x < 0$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) \to \infty$, then it contracts and subsequently it becomes asymptotically zero
(g)	$x = 1$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) = \bar{a}_1$, then it accelerated expands
(h)	$x = 1$ and $y > 1$	$\bar{a}(0) = \bar{a}_1$, then it contracts and eventually collapse
(i)	$x = 0$ and $y < 1$	$\bar{a}(0) \to \infty$, then it contracts and subsequently it becomes asymptotically constant
(j)	$x = 0$ and $y > 1$	$\bar{a}(0) \to \infty$, then it contracts and eventually collapse

Table 1: Behaviour of the scale factor depending on the relations among the parameters x and y. Note that $y > 0$.



Figure 1: The behaviour of the dimensionless scale factor is shown for cases (a), (b) and (c) in Table 1. Depending on the value of the parameters we have a scenario with a sign-transition from decelerated expansion to accelerated expansion for $x = 1.5$ and $y = 0.6$ (solid line), a scenario with accelerated expansion for $x = 3$ and $y = 0.3$ (dashed line) or a scenario that collapse for $x = 1.5$ and $y = 1.2$ (dotted line). We have chosen $\bar{a}_1 = 1$.

the Hubble expansion rate and the deceleration parameter $q = -\frac{\ddot{a}a}{\dot{a}^2}$ from (31),

$$H = Z_\infty \left(\tanh(\tau) + (x-1)\coth(\tau) - \frac{y\,\mathrm{sech}^2(\tau)}{3 - 3y\tanh(\tau)} \right), \tag{34}$$

$$q = -1 - \frac{Z_\infty^2}{3H^2} \left(2\,\mathrm{sech}^2(\tau) - 3\,(x-1)\,\mathrm{csch}^2(\tau) + \frac{(1-y^2)\,\mathrm{sech}^2(\tau)}{(1 - y\tanh(\tau))^2} \right). \tag{35}$$

From (35) we can calculate the sign-transition time for the deceleration parameter, i.e., the time when the universe experiences a transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion.

We note that in the limit $\tau \to 0$, $q \to \frac{2-x}{-1+x}$ and this value is positive for the condition $1 < x < 2$, i.e., we need this condition in order to have a decelerated phase at the beginning, with the possibility of having a sign-transition to acceleration later.

On the other hand, if we want to impose the conditions $H(t) > 0$ and $\dot{H}(t) < 0$ as in the

standard cosmological scenario [18], we find that the constraints

$$\frac{(1-x)(y\coth(\tau)-\coth^2(\tau))-y\,\mathrm{csch}(\tau)\,\mathrm{sech}(\tau)/3}{y-\coth(\tau)}<\tanh(\tau), \tag{36}$$

$$3x+2\,\mathrm{sech}^2(\tau)+\frac{1-2y\sinh(\tau)(\cosh(\tau)-y\sinh(\tau))}{(\cosh(\tau)-y\sinh(\tau))^2}>6, \tag{37}$$

must be satisfied. Nevertheless, in the right panel of Fig.2 we can see that numerically these conditions are incompatible with the condition $1<x<2$ and $0<y<1$, necessary to have an accelerated expanding phase today and a sign-transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion in this kind of scenarios.

In the left panel of Fig.2 the curves represent the lower limit of the parameter x satisfying inequality (36) and $0<y<1$. In the right panel the curves represent the lower limit in the parameter x satisfying inequality (37) and $0<y<1$. The allowed region for x, $1<x<2$, is shown in gray in both panels. We notice that during the evolution the conditions $\dot{H}<0$ become inconsistent for $\tau>1$. We conclude that in the studied cosmological scenarios, where exist the sign-transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion, necessarily exist a period with $\dot{H}\geq 0$. Note that this behaviour of the Hubble expansion rate has been used to describe the transition from a static state to an inflationary phase in Emergent Universe scenarios [20]. In Emergent scenarios the regime $\dot{H}\geq 0$ is transitory. By contrast, in our case this behaviour corresponds to the final state of evolution, see Fig.3.



Figure 2: The curves show, the lower limit of x from inequality (36) in the left panel and the lower limit of x from the inequality (37) in the right panel, for different choices of the parameter y. The solid line corresponds to $y=0$, the dot-dashed line corresponds to $y=0.6$ and the dashed line corresponds to $y=0.95$. The filled region represents the allowed range of the parameter x in order to have a sign-transition in the deceleration parameter.

More precisely, in our cosmological scenario, for $x=1.5$ and $y=0.6$ the sign-transition in the deceleration parameter occurs for $\tau=0.39$ approximately, see Fig.3. Taking this into account and considering that, if we measure Z_∞ in units of H_0 (the Hubble parameter), we can determinate from (34) the time today, which has to be larger than the sign-transition time (because in the universe the sign-transition from decelerated to accelerated expansion happened in the past). By tuning the value of Z_∞ we can find a possible value for the current time, $\tau_0=0.68$ or $\tau_0=0.84$



Figure 3: The figure show the behaviour of H/H_0 (dashed line), q (solid line) and $\dot{H}/H_0^2$ (dot-dashed line), for $x = 1.5$, $y = 0.6$ and $Z_\infty = 0.81H_0$.

for $Z_\infty = 0.81H_0$. we note that the Hubble expansion rate H reach the value H_0 twice because $\dot{H}$ becomes positive during the evolution, see Fig.3.

From the consistency of Eq.(31) we must choose $\bar{a}_1 = 1.08$ for $\tau_0 = 0.68$ in order to have $\bar{a}(\tau_0) = 1$. By choosing $\tau_0 = 0.68$ instead of $\tau_0 = 0.84$ we choose the sign change of $\dot{H}$ to be in the future at $\tau = 0.76$ approximately, becoming in this sense an observational imprint that could be observed in the near future.

Finally, in the left panel of Fig.4 we show the behaviour of the dimensionless density parameters, $\Omega_T = \frac{\rho_T}{3H^2}$ and $\Omega_m = \frac{\rho}{3H^2}$, where we have chosen the current value of the density parameter for pressureless matter to be $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315$, according with the last measurements of the Planck satellite [19]. It is interesting to note that the effective torsional fluid already start to dominate in the past and in the future $\tau \to \infty$ it becomes dominant, in an intermediate regime the pressureless fluid is dominating and at the beginning the effective torsional fluid is dominant compared to pressureless matter. In the right panel of Fig.4 we show the behaviour of the state parameter for the effective torsional effective fluid $\omega_T = p_T/\rho_T$. We observe that this parameter evolves from a fluid with $\omega_T > 0$, going through $\omega_T = 0$ to a quintessence-type fluid with $-1 < \omega_T < 0$, then to a phantom-type fluid with $\omega_T < -1$ and finally it asymptotically behaves as a cosmological constant with $\omega_T \to -1$. It is interesting to note that the value of ω_T for $\tau \to 0$ is $1/3$, corresponding to a radiation fluid.

4 Final Remarks

In this work we present a generalized Brans-Dicke theory in the framework of Horndeski theory including torsion, with the aim of analyse some cosmological consequences of the theory. By following Ref.[12], and considering pressureless matter and an effective torsional fluid, we find conditions (27) in order to get an analytical solution able to describe several possible cosmological scenarios allowed by choosing different ranges of the parameters in the theory, see Table 1. Particularly we found a cosmological scenario able of reasonable describe the dynamics of the late



Figure 4: The left panel show the behaviour of the density parameters Ω_T (solid line) and Ω_m (dashed line). The right panel show the evolution of the state parameter for the effective torsional fluid. We have fixed the parameters to $x = 1.5$, $y = 0.6$, $Z_\infty = 0.81H_0$, $\bar{a}_1 = 1.08$, $k = 0$ and $\Omega_{m0} = 0.315$.

universe.

A remarkable feature of the model is the role played by torsion as a fluid, where the source of the torsion are non-minimal couplings with the scalar field. Among all possible cosmological scenarios the most interesting is the case (c) in Table 1, where the expansion begins from a null scale factor, subsequently the expansion is decelerated and finally accelerated and the torsion plays the role of an effective fluid with a time dependent state parameter. In section 3.1 we describe a specific scenario, where the torsional fluid starts playing the role of radiation evolving to pressureless matter. Subsequently it plays the role of quintessence-like fluid and phantom-like fluid to finish asymptotically as a cosmological constant. The dominance of this effective torsional fluid changes with time, at the beginning we have a torsional fluid dominating the matter content of the universe, followed by a period dominated by the pressureless fluid, which could be consistent with the structure formation. Afterwards, torsion recovers its relevance and the model finishes with a torsional fluid dominating the universe which behaves as a cosmological constant (see Fig.4). An interesting characteristic of this scenario is that during the evolution the derivative of the Hubble expansion rate becomes positive (peculiarity non-observed in the standard cosmological scenario), which could represent a distinctive imprint of this kind of theory.

The solution revised in this work is analytical and in this sense it corresponds to a particular case. In order to get more insight into solutions of the general Lagrangian of the theory (1), a perspective of this work is to perform a dynamical system study of the theory, where it is possible to get asymptotic behaviours without need of fixing initial conditions and considering more general ranges of parameters (see for example Ref.[8]). Besides, this kind of analysis would allow us to include a radiation term to properly describe the early universe, where we have found a scenario in which the effective torsional fluid dominates over the pressureless matter.

In the current article, for the sake of simplicity we used classical spin-less matter. A natural generalization would be to consider matter with a non-vanishing spin tensor playing the role of another torsion source, besides the non-minimal couplings with the scalar field. The full consistency of the structure could help to settle this issue. On the other hand, it is possible to add new terms to the Lagrangian coupling torsion and the scalar field, this is natural in the context of

conformal symmetry (work in progress) and it may help to close the gap between torsion-full and torsionless dynamics in a more natural way than with the Lagrange multiplier shown in section 2. The consequences of such procedure in a cosmological context remain to be seen.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Adolfo Toloza for many enlightening conversations. This work was partially funded by: Comisión Nacional de Investigación Científica y Tecnológica (CONICYT) through grants 1130653, 1150719 (FI), Dirección de Investigación of Universidad del Bío-Bío through grants GI 150407/VC and 151307 3/R (AC) and CONICYT scholarships from the Government of Chile through grants 21161574 (PM) and 21161099 (DN).

References

[1] Y. Fujii and K. Maeda, *The scalar-tensor theory of gravitation*, Cambridge University Press (2007).

[2] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, *Mach's principle and a relativistic theory of gravitation*, *Phys. Rev.* **124** (1961) 925.

[3] G. W. Horndeski, *Invariant Variational Principles and Field Theories*, PhD thesis, University of Waterloo (1973); G. W. Horndeski, *Second-order scalar-tensor field equations in a four-dimensional space*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **10** (1974) 363.

[4] P. J. E. Peebles and R. H. Dicke, *Origin of the Globular Star Clusters*, *Astrophys. J.* **154** (1968) 891.

[5] D. La and P. J. Steinhardt, *Extended Inflationary Cosmology*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** (1989) 376. Erratum: [*Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** (1989) 1066].

[6] V. Faraoni, *Cosmology in Scalar-Tensor Gravity*, Springer (2004).

[7] B. Boisseau, G. Esposito-Farese, D. Polarski and A. A. Starobinsky, *Reconstruction of a scalar tensor theory of gravity in an accelerating universe*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 2236 [gr-qc/0001066]; E. Elizalde, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Late-time cosmology in (phantom) scalar-tensor theory: Dark energy and the cosmic speed-up* *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 043539 [hep-th/0405034]; S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Dark energy: The Equation of state description versus scalar-tensor or modified gravity*, *Phys. Lett.* B **634** (2006) 93 [hep-th/0512118]; R. Gannouji, D. Polarski, A. Ranquet and A. A. Starobinsky, *Scalar-Tensor Models of Normal and Phantom Dark Energy*, *JCAP* **0609** (2006) 016 [astro-ph/0606287].

[8] N. Agarwal and R. Bean, *The Dynamical viability of scalar-tensor gravity theories*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25** (2008) 165001 [arXiv:0708.3967 [astro-ph]]; A. Cid, G. Leon and Y. Leyva, *Intermediate accelerated solutions as generic late-time attractors in a*

modified Jordan-Brans-Dicke theory, *JCAP* **1602** (2016) no.02, 027 [arXiv:1506.00186 [gr-qc]].

[9] E. Cartan, *Sur une generalisation de la notion de courbure de Riemann et les espaces a torsion. C.* R. Acad. Sci. (Paris), **174** (1922) 593; E. Cartan, *Sur les varietes a connexion affine et la theorie de la relativite generalisee. (premiere partie)*, *Annales Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **40**, 325 (1923); E. Cartan, *Sur les varietes a connexion affine et la theorie de la relativite generalisee. (premiere partie) (Suite)*, *Annales Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **41**, 1 (1924).

[10] N. J. Popawski, *Cosmology with torsion: An alternative to cosmic inflation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **694** (2010) 181. Erratum: [*Phys. Lett. B* **701** (2011) 672] [arXiv:1007.0587 [astro-ph.CO]].

[11] N. J. Poplawski, *Nonsingular, big-bounce cosmology from spinor-torsion coupling*, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 107502 [arXiv:1111.4595 [gr-qc]].

[12] A. Toloza and J. Zanelli, *Cosmology with scalarEuler form coupling*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013) 135003 [arXiv:1301.0821 [gr-qc]].

[13] O. Valdivia, J. Barrientos, F. Cordonier-Tello, F. Izaurieta, P. Medina, D. Narbona and E. Rodriguez, *Nonminimal couplings, gravitational waves, and torsion in Horndeski's theory*, [arXiv:1703.09686 [gr-qc]]. Sent to *Phys. Rev. D.*

[14] S. del Campo, R. Herrera and P. Labrana, *On the Stability of Jordan-Brans-Dicke Static Universe*, *JCAP* **0907** (2009) 006 [arXiv:0905.0614 [gr-qc]].

[15] A. Van Proeyen, *Supergravity*, Cambridge University Press (2012).

[16] A. A. Starobinsky, *Disappearing cosmological constant in f(R) gravity*, *JETP Lett.* **86** (2007) 157 [arXiv:0706.2041 [astro-ph]].

[17] R. R. Caldwell, M. Kamionkowski and N. N. Weinberg, *Phantom energy and cosmic doomsday*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 071301 [astro-ph/0302506].

[18] S. Weinberg, *Cosmology*, Oxford (2008).

[19] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13 [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] P. Labrana, *Emergent Universe Scenario and the Low CMB Multipoles*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **720**, 012016 (2016); C. Rios, P. Labrana and A. Cid, *The Emergent Universe and the Anomalies in the Cosmic Microwave Background*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **720**, 012008 (2016).